Success probability of the Babai estimators for box-constrained integer linear models

Jinming Wen and Xiao-Wen Chang

arXiv:1410.5040v1 [cs.IT] 19 Oct 2014

Abstract

To estimate the box-constrained integer parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in a linear model, a typical method is to solve a box-constrained integer least squares (BILS) problem. However, due to its high complexity, the box-constrained Babai integer point $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ is commonly used as a suboptimal solution.

First we derive formulas for the success probability P^{BB} of $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ and the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai integer point $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ when $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the constraint box. Some properties of P^{BB} and P^{OB} and the relationship between them are studied.

Then we investigate the effects of some column permutation strategies on $\boldsymbol{P}^{\text{BB}}$. The V-BLAST and SQRD column permutation strategies are often used to get better Babai integer points. The permutation strategy involved in the well-known LLL lattice reduction, to be referred to as LLL-P, can also be used for this purpose. On the one hand we show that under a condition LLL-P always increases P^{BB} and argue why both V-BLAST and SQRD often increase P^{BB} under the same condition; and on the other hand we show that under an opposite condition LLL-P always decreases P^{BB} and argue why both V-BLAST and SQRD often decrease P^{BB} under the same condition. We also derive a column permutation invariant bound on P^{BB}, which is an upper bound and a lower bound under the two opposite conditions, respectively. Numerical results will be given to demonstrate our findings.

Finally we consider a conjecture concerning the ordinary Babai integer point proposed by Ma et al. We first construct an example to show that the conjecture does not hold in general, and then show that the conjecture does hold under some conditions.

Index Terms

Box-constrained integer least squares estimation, Babai integer point, success probability, column permutations, LLL-P, SQRD, V-BLAST.

I. Introduction

SUPPOSE that we have the following box-constrained linear model:

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} + \boldsymbol{v}, \quad \boldsymbol{v} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2\boldsymbol{I}) \tag{1a}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B} \equiv \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \boldsymbol{l} \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{u},\ \boldsymbol{l}, \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} \tag{1b}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an observation vector, $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is a deterministic model matrix with full column rank, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is an unknown integer parameter vector in the box $\mathcal{B}$, $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a noise vector following the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2\boldsymbol{I})$ with σ being known. This model arises from some applications, including wireless communications, see e.g., [10], [12]. In this paper we assume that $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is random and uniformly distributed over the box $\mathcal{B}$. This assumption is often made for MIMO applications, see, e.g., [21].

A common method to estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in (1) is to solve the following box-constrained integer least squares (BILS) problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}} \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \tag{2}$$

whose solution is the maximum likelihood estimator of $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$. A typical approach to solving (2) is discrete search, which usually has two stages: reduction and search. In the first stage, orthogonal transformations are used to transform $\boldsymbol{A}$ to an upper triangular matrix $\boldsymbol{R}$. To make the search process more efficient, a column permutation strategy is often used in reduction. Two well-known strategies are V-BLAST [13], [10] and SQRD [36], [7]. The commonly used search methods are the so-called sphere decoding methods, see, e.g., [10], [5] and [7], which are the extensions of the Schnorr-Euchner search method [29], a variation of the Fincke-Pohst search method [11], for ordinary integer least squares problems to be mentioned below.

Jinming Wen is with The Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 0B9, Canada (e-mail: jinming.wen@mail.mcgill.ca).

X.-W. Chang is with The School of Computer Science, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 2A7, Canada (e-mail: chang@cs.mcgill.ca). This research was supported by NSERC of Canada Grant RGPIN217191-07.

Manuscript received; revised .

If the true parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in the linear model (1a) is not subject to any constraint, then we say (1a) is an ordinary linear model. In this case, to estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$, one solves an ordinary integer least squares (OILS) problem

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{Z}^n} \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2. \tag{3}$$

The OILS problem (3) is also referred to as the closest vector problem, as it is equivalent to find a point in the lattice $\{\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$ which is closest to $\boldsymbol{y}$. For algorithms and theories for OILS problems, see the survey papers [1] and [16].

The most widely used reduction strategy in solving (3) is the LLL reduction [23], which consists of size reductions and column permutations. But it is difficult to use it to solve a BILS problem because after size reductions the box constraint would become too complicated to handle in the search process. However, one can only use its permutation strategy, to be referred to as LLL-P (in [9] we referred it to asLLL-permute). The LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST strategies use only the information of $\boldsymbol{A}$ to do the column permutations. Some column permutation strategies which use not only the information of $\boldsymbol{A}$, but also the information of $\boldsymbol{y}$ and the box constraint have also been proposed, see e.g., [31], [7] and [6].

Although it was shown in [19] that in communication applications for a wide range of signal-to-noise ratios and dimensions, the expected complexity of solving (2) by the Fincke-Pohst search method is polynomial, the expected number of nodes visited in the search tree tends to infinity as an exponential function for a large class of detection problems [21]. So for some real-time applications, an approximate solution, which can be produced quickly, is computed instead. For the OILS problem, the Babai integer point $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$, to be referred to as the ordinary Babai estimator, which can be obtained by the Babai nearest plane algorithm [3], is an often used approximate solution. Taking the box constraint into account, one can easily modify the Babai nearest plane algorithm to get an approximate solution $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ to the BILS problem (2), to be referred to as the box-constrained Babai estimator. This estimator is the first point found by the search methods proposed in [5], [10] and [7] and it has been used as a suboptimal solution, see, e.g., [34]. In communications, algorithms for finding the Babai estimators are often referred to as successive interference cancelation detectors. There have been algorithms which find other suboptimal solutions to the BILS problems in communications, see, e.g., [26], [2], [15], [14], [4], [30], [20], [35], [22] etc. But in the this paper we will focus on the Babai estimators.

In order to verify whether an estimator is good enough for a practical use, one needs to find the probability of the estimator being equal to the true integer parameter vector, which is referred to as success probability [17]. The probability of wrong estimation is referred to as error probability, see, e.g., [20].

For the estimation of $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in the ordinary linear model (1a), where $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is supposed to be deterministic, the formula of the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ was first given in [32], which considers a variant form of the ILS problem (3). A simple derivation for an equivalent formula of P^{OB} was given in [9]. It was shown in [9] that P^{OB} increases after applying the LLL reduction algorithm or only the LLL-P column permutation strategy, but it may decrease after applying the SQRD and V-BLAST permutation strategies.

The main goal of this paper is to extend the main results we obtained in [9] for the ordinary case to the box-constrained case. We will present a formula for the success probability P^{BB} of the box-constrained Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ and a formula for the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ when $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in (1) follows a uniform distribution over the box $\mathcal{B}$. Some properties of P^{BB} and P^{OB} and the relationship between them will also be given.

Then we will investigate the effect of the LLL-P column permutation strategy on P^{BB}. We will show that P^{BB} increases under a condition. Surprisingly, we will also show that P^{BB} decreases after LLL-P is applied under an opposite condition. Roughly speaking the two opposite conditions are that the noise standard deviation σ in (1a) are relatively small and large, respectively. This is different from the ordinary case, where P^{OB} always increases after the LLL-P strategy is applied. Although our theoretical results for LLL-P cannot be extended to SQRD and V-BLAST, our numerical tests indicate that under the two conditions, often (not always) P^{BB} increases and decreases, respectively, after applying SQRD or V-BLAST. Explanations will be given for these phenomenons. These suggest that before we apply LLL-P, SQRD or V-BLAST we should check the conditions. Moreover, we will give a bound on P^{BB}, which is column permutation invariant. It is interesting that the bound is an upper bound under the small noise condition we just mentioned and becomes a lower bound under the opposite condition.

In [27], the authors made a conjecture, based on which a stopping criterion for the search process was proposed to reduce the computational cost of solving the BILS problem. The conjecture is related to the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$. We will first show that the conjecture does not always hold and then show it holds under a condition.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II, we introduce the QR reduction and the LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST column recording strategies. In section III, we present the formulas for P^{BB} and P^{OB}, study the properties of P^{BB} and P^{OB} and the relationship between them. In section IV, we investigate the effects of the LLL-P, SQRD and

V-BLAST column permutation strategies and derive a bound on P^{BB}. In section V, we investigate the conjecture made in [27] and obtain some negative and positive results. Finally we summarize this paper in section VI.

Notation. For matrices, we use bold capital letters and for vectors we use bold small letters. For $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $\lfloor \boldsymbol{x} \rceil$ to denote its nearest integer vector, i.e., each entry of $\boldsymbol{x}$ is rounded to its nearest integer (if there is a tie, the one with smaller magnitude is chosen). For a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{x}_{i:j}$ denotes the subvector of $\boldsymbol{x}$ formed by entries $i, i+1, \ldots, j$. For a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, $\boldsymbol{A}_{i:j,i:j}$ denotes the submatrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$ formed by rows and columns $i, i+1, \ldots, j$.

II. QR Reduction and Column Reordering

Assume that the model matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ in the linear model (1a) has the QR factorization

$$\boldsymbol{A} = [\boldsymbol{Q}_1, \boldsymbol{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{R} \\ \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where $[\underset{n}{\boldsymbol{Q}_1}, \underset{m-n}{\boldsymbol{Q}_2}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ is orthogonal and $\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is upper triangular. Without loss of generality, we assume that the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ are positive throughout the paper. Define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}} = \boldsymbol{Q}_1^T \boldsymbol{y}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} = \boldsymbol{Q}_1^T \boldsymbol{v}$. Then, the linear model (1) is reduced to

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}} = \boldsymbol{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}, \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}), \tag{5a}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B} \equiv \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \boldsymbol{l} \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{u},\ \boldsymbol{l}, \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} \tag{5b}$$

and the BILS problem (2) is reduced to

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}} - \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2. \tag{6}$$

To solve the reduced problem (6) sphere decoding search algorithms are usually used to find the optimal solution. For search efficiency, one typically adopts a column permutation strategy, such as V-BLAST, SQRD or LLL-P, in the reduction process to obtain a better $\boldsymbol{R}$. For the sake of description simplicity, we assume that the column permutations are performed on $\boldsymbol{R}$ in (4) no matter which strategy is used, i.e.,

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{P} = \bar{\boldsymbol{R}} \tag{7}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{Q}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is orthogonal, $\boldsymbol{P} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n\times n}$ is a permutation matrix, and $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is an upper triangular matrix satisfying the properties of the corresponding column permutation strategies. Notice that combining (4) and (7) result in the following QR factorization of the column reordered $\boldsymbol{A}$:

$$\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{P} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\boldsymbol{R}} \\ \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}} \equiv \boldsymbol{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{I}_{m-n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The V-BLAST strategy determines the columns of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ from the last to the first. Suppose columns $n, n-1, \ldots, k+1$ of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ have been determined, this strategy chooses a column from k remaining columns of $\boldsymbol{R}$ as the k-th column such that $|\bar{r}_{kk}|$ is maximum over all of the k choices. For more details, including efficient algorithms, see [13], [10], [18], [8], [24], [37] etc. For the performance analysis of V-BLAST, one may refer to [25].

In contrast to V-BLAST, the SQRD strategy determines the columns of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ from the first to the last by using the modified Gram-Schmidt algorithm or the Householder QR algorithm. Suppose columns $1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ have been determined. In the k-th step of the algorithm, the k-th column of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ we seek is chosen from the remaining $n-k+1$ columns of $\boldsymbol{R}$ such that $|\bar{r}_{kk}|$ is smallest. For more details, see [36] and [7] etc.

The LLL-P strategy [9] does the column permutations of the LLL reduction algorithm and produces $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ satisfying the Lovász condition:

$$\delta\, \bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}^2 \le \bar{r}_{k-1,k}^2 + \bar{r}_{kk}^2, \quad k = 2, 3, \ldots, n \tag{8}$$

where δ is a parameter satisfying $1/4 < \delta \le 1$. Suppose that $\delta\, r_{k-1,k-1}^2 > r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{k,k}^2$ for some k. Then we interchange columns $k-1$ and k of $\boldsymbol{R}$. After the permutation the upper triangular structure of $\boldsymbol{R}$ is no longer maintained. But we can bring $\boldsymbol{R}$ back to an upper triangular matrix by using the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization technique (see [23]) or by a Givens rotation:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{R}} = \boldsymbol{G}_{k-1,k}^T \boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k} \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{G}_{k-1,k}$ is an orthogonal matrix and $\boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k}$ is a permutation matrix, and

$$\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}^2 = r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{k,k}^2, \quad \bar{r}_{k-1,k}^2 + \bar{r}_{k,k}^2 = r_{k-1,k-1}^2, \quad \bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}\bar{r}_{kk} = r_{k-1,k-1} r_{kk}. \tag{10}$$

Algorithm 1 LLL-P

set $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{I}_n$, $k = 2$;
while $k \leq n$ **do**
  if $\delta\, r_{k-1,k-1}^2 > r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{kk}^2$ **then**
    perform a column permutation: $\boldsymbol{R}{=}\boldsymbol{G}_{k-1,k}^T \boldsymbol{R}\boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k}$;
    update $\boldsymbol{P}$: $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k}$;
    $k = k - 1$, when $k > 2$;
  else
    $k = k + 1$;
  end if
end while

Note that the above operation guarantees that the inequality in (8) holds. For simplicity, later when we refer to a column permutation, we mean the whole process of a column permutation and triangularization. For readers' convenience, we describe the LLL-P strategy as follows.

With the QR factorization (7), we define

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{z}} = \boldsymbol{P}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{v}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}, \\ &\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{P}^T \boldsymbol{x}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{l}} = \boldsymbol{P}^T \boldsymbol{l}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{P}^T \boldsymbol{u}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Then the linear model (5) is transformed to

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{R}}\hat{\boldsymbol{z}} + \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{v}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}), \tag{12a}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{z}} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}} = \{\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \bar{\boldsymbol{l}} \leq \boldsymbol{z} \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{u}},\ \bar{\boldsymbol{l}},\ \bar{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} \tag{12b}$$

and the BILS problem (6) is transformed to

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{z} \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{R}}\boldsymbol{z}\|_2^2 \tag{13}$$

whose solution is the BILS estimator of $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$.

III. Success Probabilities of the Babai estimators

We consider the reduced box-constrained liner model (5). The same analysis can be applied to the transformed reduced linear model (12).

The box-constrained Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ of $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in (5), a suboptimal solution to (6), can be computed as follows:

$$c_i^{\text{BB}} = (\tilde{y}_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} r_{ij} x_j^{\text{BB}})/r_{ii}, \quad x_i^{\text{BB}} = \begin{cases} l_i, & \text{if } \ \lfloor c_i^{\text{BB}} \rceil \leq l_i \\ \lfloor c_i^{\text{BB}} \rceil, & \text{if } \ l_i < \lfloor c_i^{\text{BB}} \rceil < u_i \\ u_i, & \text{if } \ \lfloor c_i^{\text{BB}} \rceil \geq u_i \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

for $i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$, where $\sum_{i+1}^{n} = 0$ if $i = n$. If we do not take the box constraint into account, we get the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$:

$$c_i^{\text{OB}} = (\tilde{y}_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} r_{ij} x_j^{\text{OB}})/r_{ii}, \quad x_i^{\text{OB}} = \lfloor c_i^{\text{OB}} \rceil \tag{15}$$

for $i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$.

In the following, we give formulas for the success probability of $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}}$ and for the success probability of $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$.

Theorem 1: Suppose that in the linear model (1) $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the constraint box $\mathcal{B}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are independent. Suppose that the linear model (1) is transformed to the linear model (5) through the QR factorization (4). Then

$$P^{\text{BB}} \equiv \Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Big[\frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1} + \frac{u_i - l_i}{u_i - l_i + 1} \phi_\sigma(r_{ii})\Big], \tag{16}$$

$$P^{\text{OB}} \equiv \Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) \tag{17}$$

where

$$\phi_\sigma(\zeta) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{\frac{\zeta}{2\sigma}} \exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\big)dt. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Since the random vectors $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ in (1) are independent, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ in (5) are also independent. From (5a),

$$\tilde{y}_i = r_{ii}\hat{x}_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} r_{ij}\hat{x}_j + \tilde{v}_i.$$

Then from (14), we obtain

$$c_i^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \frac{r_{ij}}{r_{ii}}(\hat{x}_j - x_j^{\text{BB}}) + \frac{\tilde{v}_i}{r_{ii}}, \quad i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1. \tag{19}$$

Therefore, if $x_{i+1}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_{i+1}, \cdots, x_n^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_n$ and $\hat{x}_i$ is fixed,

$$c_i^{\text{BB}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}_i, \sigma^2/r_{ii}^2). \tag{20}$$

To simplify notation, denote event

$$E_i = (x_i^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_i, \ldots, x_n^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_n), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Then by the chain rule of conditional probabilities,

$$P^{\text{BB}} = \Pr(E_1) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Pr(x_i^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_i | E_{i+1}) \tag{21}$$

where E_{n+1} is the sample space Ω, so $\Pr(x_n^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_n | E_{n+1}) = \Pr(x_n^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_n)$.

In the following we will use this fact: if A, B and C are three events and A and C are independent, then

$$\Pr(A, B|C) = \Pr(A)\Pr(B|A, C). \tag{22}$$

This can easily be verified.

Using (22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(x_i^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_i \,|\, E_{i+1}) &= \Pr(\hat{x}_i = l_i, c_i^{\text{BB}} \le l_i + 1/2 \,|\, E_{i+1}) && (23)\\
&\quad + \Pr(l_i < \hat{x}_i < u_i, \hat{x}_i - 1/2 \le c_i^{\text{BB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, E_{i+1})\\
&\quad + \Pr(\hat{x}_i = u_i, c_i^{\text{BB}} \ge u_i - 1/2 \,|\, E_{i+1})\\
&= \Pr(\hat{x}_i = l_i)\Pr(c_i^{\text{BB}} \le l_i + 1/2 \,|\, \hat{x}_i = l_i, E_{i+1}) && (24)\\
&\quad + \Pr(l_i < \hat{x}_i < u_i)\Pr(\hat{x}_i - 1/2 \le c_i^{\text{BB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, l_i < \hat{x}_i < u_i, E_{i+1})\\
&\quad + \Pr(\hat{x}_i = u_i)\Pr(c_i^{\text{BB}} \ge u_i - 1/2 \,|\, \hat{x}_i = u_i, E_{i+1})
\end{aligned}$$

where in deriving the second equality we used the independency of relevant events, which can be observed from (19) and (14).

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the box $\mathcal{B}$, for the first factors of the three terms on the right-hand side of (24), we have

$$\Pr(\hat{x}_i = l_i) = \frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1}, \quad \Pr(l_i < \hat{x}_i < u_i) = \frac{u_i - l_i - 1}{u_i - l_i + 1}, \quad \Pr(\hat{x}_i = u_i) = \frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1}.$$

By (20), for the second factors of these three terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(c_i^{\text{BB}} \le l_i + 1/2 \,|\, \hat{x}_i = l_i, E_{i+1}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2}} \int_{-\infty}^{l_i + \frac{1}{2}} \exp\Big(-\frac{(t - l_i)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2}\Big)dt\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{r_{ii}}{2\sigma}} \exp\big(-\frac{t^2}{2}\big)dt = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \phi_\sigma(r_{ii})],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Pr(\hat{x}_i - 1/2 \le c_i^{\text{BB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, l_i < \hat{x}_i < u_i, E_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2}} \int_{\hat{x}_i - \frac{1}{2}}^{\hat{x}_i + \frac{1}{2}} \exp\Big(-\frac{(t - \hat{x}_i)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2}\Big)dt = \phi_\sigma(r_{ii}),$$

$$\Pr(c_i^{\text{BB}} \geq u_i - 1/2 \,|\, \hat{x}_i = u_i, E_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2}} \int_{u_i - \frac{1}{2}}^{\infty} \exp\Big(- \frac{(t-u_i)^2}{2(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ii}})^2} \Big) dt = \frac{1}{2}[1 + \phi_\sigma(r_{ii})].$$

Combining the equalities above, from (24) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(x_i^{\text{BB}} = \hat{x}_i \,|\, E_{i+1}) &= \frac{1}{2(u_i - l_i + 1)}[1 + \phi_\sigma(r_{ii})] + \frac{u_i - l_i - 1}{u_i - l_i + 1}\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) + \frac{1}{2(u_i - l_i + 1)}[1 + \phi_\sigma(r_{ii})] \\ &= \frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1} + \frac{u_i - l_i}{u_i - l_i + 1}\phi_\sigma(r_{ii})\end{aligned}$$

which, with (21), gives (16).

Now we consider the success probability of the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$. Everything in the first three paragraphs of this proof still holds if we replace each superscript BB by OB. But we need to make more significant changes to the last two paragraphs. We change (23) and (24) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i \,|\, E_{i+1}) &= \Pr(l_i \leq \hat{x}_i \leq u_i, \hat{x}_i - 1/2 \leq c_i^{\text{OB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, E_{i+1}) \\ &= \Pr(l_i \leq \hat{x}_i \leq u_i) \Pr(\hat{x}_i - 1/2 \leq c_i^{\text{OB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, l_i \leq \hat{x}_i \leq u_i, E_{i+1}).\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr(l_i \leq \hat{x}_i \leq u_i) = 1, \\ &\Pr(\hat{x}_i - 1/2 \leq c_i^{\text{OB}} < \hat{x}_i + 1/2 \,|\, l_i \leq \hat{x}_i \leq u_i, E_{i+1}) = \phi_\sigma(r_{ii}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\Pr(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i \,|\, E_{i+1}) = \phi_\sigma(r_{ii}).$$

Then (17) follows from (21) with each superscript BB replaced by OB. □

From the proof for (17), we observe that the formula holds no matter what distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is over the box $\mathcal{B}$. Furthermore, the formula is identical to the one for the success probability of the ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ when $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in the linear model (1) is deterministic and is not subject to any box constraint, see [9].

The following result shows the relation between P^{BB} and P^{OB}.

Corollary 1: Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1,

$$P^{\text{OB}} \leq P^{\text{BB}}, \tag{25}$$

$$\lim_{\forall i, u_i - l_i \to \infty} P^{\text{BB}} = P^{\text{OB}}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. Note that $\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) \leq 1$. Thus

$$\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) = \frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1}\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) + \frac{u_i - l_i}{u_i - l_i + 1}\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}) \leq \frac{1}{u_i - l_i + 1} + \frac{u_i - l_i}{u_i - l_i + 1}\phi_\sigma(r_{ii}).$$

Then (25) follows from Theorem 1. Obviously the equality (26) holds. □

Corollary 2: Under the same assumption as in Theorem 1, P^{BB} and P^{OB} increase when σ decreases and

$$\lim_{\sigma \to 0} P^{\text{BB}} = \lim_{\sigma \to 0} P^{\text{OB}} = 1.$$

Proof. For a given ζ, when σ decreases $\phi_\sigma(\zeta)$ increases and $\lim_{\sigma \to 0} \phi_\sigma(\zeta) = 1$. Then from (16) and (17), we immediately see that the corollary holds.

IV. Effects of permutations on P^{BB}

Suppose we perform the QR factorization (7) by using a column permutation strategy, such as LLL-P, SQRD or V-BLAST. Then we have the reduced box-constrained linear model (12). For (12) we can define its corresponding Babai point $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}}$, and use it as an estimator of $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$, which is equal to $\boldsymbol{P}^T\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$, or equivalently we use $\boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}}$ as an estimator of $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$.

In this section, we will investigate how applying the LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST column permutation strategies affect the success probability P^{BB} of the box-constrained Babai estimator.

A. *Effect of column permutations by LLL-P on P^{BB}*

The LLL-P strategy involves a sequence of permutations of two consecutive columns of $\boldsymbol{R}$. To investigate how LLL-P affects P^{BB}, we look at one column permutation first. Suppose that $\delta\, r_{k-1,k-1}^2 > r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{kk}^2$ for some k for the $\boldsymbol{R}$ matrix in the linear model (5). After the permutation of columns $k-1$ and k, $\boldsymbol{R}$ becomes $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}} = \boldsymbol{G}_{k-1,k}^T \boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k}$ (see (9)). Then with the transformations given in (11), where $\bar{\boldsymbol{Q}} = \boldsymbol{G}_{k-1,k}$ and $\boldsymbol{P} = \boldsymbol{P}_{k-1,k}$, the linear model (5) is transformed to the linear model (12). We will compare $\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}})$ and $\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}})$.

To prove our results, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1: Given $\alpha \geq 0$, define

$$f(\zeta, \alpha) = (1-\zeta^2)\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp\big(-\frac{t^2}{2}\big)dt\Big) - \zeta \exp\big(-\frac{\zeta^2}{2}\big), \quad \zeta \geq 0. \tag{27}$$

Then, $f(\zeta, \alpha)$ is a strictly decreasing function of ζ and has a unique zero $r(\alpha)$, i.e.,

$$f(r(\alpha), \alpha) = 0. \tag{28}$$

When $\zeta > r(\alpha)$, $f(\zeta, \alpha) < 0$ and when $\zeta < r(\alpha) \neq 0$, $f(\zeta, \alpha) > 0$. Furthermore, $0 \leq r(\alpha) < 1$, where the first inequality becomes an equality if and only if $\alpha = 0$, and $r(\alpha)$ is a strictly increasing function of α.

Proof. By a simple calculation, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial f(\zeta, \alpha)}{\partial \zeta} = -2\zeta\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big).$$

Thus, for any $\zeta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, $\partial f(\zeta, \alpha)/\partial \zeta \leq 0$, where the equality holds if and only $\zeta = 0$. Therefore, $f(\zeta, \alpha)$ is a strictly decreasing function of ζ.

Since $f(0, \alpha) = \alpha \geq 0$ and $f(1, \alpha) < 0$, there exists a unique $r(\alpha)$ such that (28) holds and $0 \leq r(\alpha) < 1$. Obviously $r(0) = 0$. Since $f(\zeta, \alpha)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to ζ, when $\zeta > r(\alpha)$, $f(\zeta, \alpha) < 0$ and when $\zeta < r(\alpha)$, $f(\zeta, \alpha) > 0$.

From (28), we obtain that for $\alpha > 0$,

$$r'(\alpha) = \frac{\big(1 - (r(\alpha))^2\big)^2}{2(r(\alpha))^2 \exp\left(-(r(\alpha))^2/2\right)} > 0.$$

Thus, $r(\alpha)$ is a strictly increasing function of α. □

Given α, we can easily solve (28) by a numerical method, e.g., the Newton method, to find $r(\alpha)$.

Lemma 2: Given $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta > 0$, define

$$g(\zeta, \alpha, \beta) = \alpha\Big(\int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt + \int_0^{\beta/\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big) + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt \int_0^{\beta/\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt, \quad \zeta > 0. \tag{29}$$

Then, when

$$\min\{\sqrt{\beta}, \beta/r(\alpha)\} \leq \zeta < \max\{\sqrt{\beta}, \beta/r(\alpha)\} \tag{30}$$

where $r(\alpha)$ is defined in Lemma 1 and $\beta/r(\alpha) \equiv \infty$ if $\alpha = 0$, $g(\zeta, \alpha, \beta)$ is a strictly decreasing function of ζ.

Proof. From the definition of g, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial g(\zeta, \alpha, \beta)}{\partial \zeta} &= \alpha\Big(\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\zeta^2) - \frac{\beta}{\zeta^2}\exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\beta^2}{\zeta^2}\big)\Big) + \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\zeta^2)\int_0^{\beta/\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt - \frac{\beta}{\zeta^2}\exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\beta^2}{\zeta^2}\big)\int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta}\Big[\zeta\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\zeta^2)\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\beta/\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big) - \frac{\beta}{\zeta}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\beta^2}{\zeta^2})\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big)\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta}\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\beta/\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big)\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big)\left[h(\zeta, \alpha) - h(\beta/\zeta, \alpha)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$h(\zeta, \alpha) = \frac{\zeta \exp(-\frac{\zeta^2}{2})}{\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt}.$$

It is easy to see that in order to show the result, we need only to show $h(\zeta, \alpha) - h(\beta/\zeta, \alpha) < 0$ under the condition (30) with $\zeta \neq \beta/\zeta$.

By some simple calculations and (27), we have

$$\frac{\partial h(\zeta,\alpha)}{\partial \zeta} = \frac{\exp(-\frac{\zeta^2}{2})}{\Big(\alpha + \int_0^{\zeta} \exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt\Big)^2} \times f(\zeta,\alpha). \tag{31}$$

Now we assume that ζ satisfies (30) with $\zeta \neq \beta/\zeta$. If $\sqrt{\beta} < \beta/r(\alpha)$, then $\zeta > \beta/\zeta > r(\alpha)$ and by Lemma 1, $\partial h(\zeta,\alpha)/\partial\zeta < 0$, i.e., $h(\zeta,\alpha)$ is a strictly deceasing function of ζ, thus $h(\zeta,\alpha) - h(\beta/\zeta,\alpha) < 0$. If $\sqrt{\beta} > \beta/r(\alpha)$, then $\zeta < \beta/\zeta < r(\alpha)$ and by Lemma 1, $\partial h(\zeta,\alpha)/\partial\zeta > 0$, i.e., $h(\zeta,\alpha)$ is a strictly increasing function of ζ, thus again $h(\zeta,\alpha) - h(\beta/\zeta,\alpha) < 0$. $\square$

With the above lemmas, we can show how the success probability of the box-constrained Babai estimator changes after two consecutive columns are swapped when the LLL-P strategy is applied.

Theorem 2: Suppose that in the linear model (1) the box $\mathcal{B}$ is a cube with edge length of d, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{B}$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are independent. Suppose that the linear model (1) is transformed to the linear model (5) through the QR factorization (4) and $\delta\, r_{k-1,k-1}^2 > r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{kk}^2$. After the permutation of columns $k-1$ and k of $\boldsymbol{R}$ (see (9)), the linear model (5) is transformed to the linear model (12).

1) If $r_{kk}/2\sigma \geq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$, where $r(\cdot)$ is defined in Lemma 1, then after the permutation, the success probability of the box-constrained Babai estimator increases, i.e.,

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}). \tag{32}$$

2) If $r_{k-1,k-1}/2\sigma \leq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$, then after the permutation, the success probability of the box-constrained Babai estimator decreases, i.e.,

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \geq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}). \tag{33}$$

Furthermore, the equality in each of (32) and (33) holds if and only if $r_{k-1,k} = 0$.

Proof. When $r_{k-1,k} = 0$, by Theorem 1, we see the equalities in (32) and (33) hold. In the following we assume $r_{k-1,k} \neq 0$ and show the strict inequalities in (32) and (33) hold.

Define

$$\beta \equiv \frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}\frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma} = \frac{\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}\frac{\bar{r}_{kk}}{2\sigma} \tag{34}$$

where for the second equality, see (10). Using $\delta\, r_{k-1,k-1}^2 > r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{kk}^2$ and the equalities in (10), we can easily verify that

$$\sqrt{\beta} \leq \max\Big\{\frac{\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{\bar{r}_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\} < \max\Big\{\frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\} = \frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma} = \frac{\beta}{r_{kk}/(2\sigma)}, \tag{35}$$

$$\frac{\beta}{r_{k-1,k-1}/(2\sigma)} = \frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma} = \min\Big\{\frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\} < \min\Big\{\frac{\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{\bar{r}_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\} \leq \sqrt{\beta}. \tag{36}$$

Now we prove part 1. Note that after the permutation, $r_{k-1,k-1}$ and r_{kk} change, but other diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ do not change. Then by Theorem 1, we can easily observe that (32) is equivalent to

$$\Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(r_{k-1,k-1})\Big]\Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(r_{kk})\Big] \leq \Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1})\Big]\Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(\bar{r}_{kk})\Big]. \tag{37}$$

By the definition of ϕ_σ in (18) and the definition of g in (29), we can easily verify that (37) is equivalent to

$$g\Big(\max\Big\{\frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\}, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d}, \beta\Big) \leq g\Big(\max\Big\{\frac{\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{\bar{r}_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\}, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d}, \beta\Big). \tag{38}$$

If $r_{kk}/2\sigma \geq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$, then the right-hand side of the last equality in (35) satisfies

$$\frac{\beta}{r_{kk}/(2\sigma)} \leq \frac{\beta}{r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))}. \tag{39}$$

Then by combining (35) and (39) and applying Lemma 2 we can conclude that the strict inequality in (38) holds.

The proof for part 2 is similar. The inequality (33) is equivalent to

$$g\Big(\min\Big\{\frac{r_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{r_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\}, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d}, \beta\Big) \geq g\Big(\min\Big\{\frac{\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1}}{2\sigma}, \frac{\bar{r}_{kk}}{2\sigma}\Big\}, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d}, \beta\Big). \tag{40}$$

If $r_{k-1,k-1}/2\sigma \leq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$, then the left-hand side of the first equality in (36) satisfies

$$\frac{\beta}{r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))} \leq \frac{\beta}{r_{k-1,k-1}/(2\sigma)}. \tag{41}$$

Then by combining (36) and (41) and applying Lemma 2 we can conclude that the strict inequality in (40) holds. □

We make a few remarks about Theorem 2.

Remark 1: In the theorem, $\mathcal{B}$ is assumed to be a cube, not a more general box. This restriction simplified the theoretical analysis. In practical applications, such as communications, indeed $\mathcal{B}$ is often a cube.

Remark 2: After the permutation, the larger one of $r_{k-1,k-1}$ and r_{kk} becomes smaller (see (35)) and the smaller one becomes larger (see (36)), so the gap between $r_{k-1,k-1}$ and r_{kk} becomes smaller. This makes P^{BB} increase under the condition $r_{kk}/2\sigma \geq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$ or decrease under the condition $r_{k-1,k-1}/2\sigma \leq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$. It is natural to ask for fixed $r_{k-1,k-1}$ and r_{kk} when will P^{BB} increase most or decrease most after the permutation under the the corresponding conditions? From the proof we observe that P^{BB} will become maximal when the first inequality in (35) becomes an equality or minimal when the last inequality in (36) becomes an equality under the corresponding conditions. Either of the two equalities holds if and only if $\bar{r}_{k-1,k-1} = \bar{r}_{kk}$, which is equivalent to $r_{k-1,k}^2 + r_{kk}^2 = r_{k-1,k-1}r_{kk}$ by (10).

Remark 3: The case where $r_{kk}/2\sigma < r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)) < r_{k-1,k-1}/2\sigma$ is not covered by the theorem. For this case, P^{BB} may increase or decrease after the permutation, for more details, see the simulations in Sec. IV-D.

Based on Theorem 2, we can establish the following general result for the LLL-P strategy.

Theorem 3: Suppose that in the linear model (1) the box $\mathcal{B}$ is a cube with edge length of d, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{B}$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are independent. Suppose that the linear model (1) is first transformed to the linear model (5) through the QR factorization (4) and then to the new linear model (12) through the QR factorization (7) where the LLL-P strategy is used for column permutations.

1) If the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ in (5) satisfies

$$\min_i r_{ii}/(2\sigma) \geq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)), \tag{42}$$

where $r(\cdot)$ is defined in Lemma 1, then

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}). \tag{43}$$

2) If the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ in (5) satisfies

$$\max_i r_{ii}/(2\sigma) \leq r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)), \tag{44}$$

then

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \geq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}). \tag{45}$$

And the equalities in (43) and (45) hold if and only if no column permutation occurs in the process or whenever two consecutive columns, say $k-1$ and k, are permuted, $r_{k-1,k} = 0$.

Proof. It is easy to show that after each column permutation, the smaller one of the two diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ involved in the permutation either keeps unchanged (the involved super-diagonal entry is 0 in this case) or strictly increases, while the larger one either keeps unchanged or strictly decreases (see (35) and (36)). Thus, after each column permutation, the minimum of the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ either keeps unchanged or strictly increases and the maximum either keeps unchanged or strictly decreases, so the diagonal entries of any upper triangular $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ produced after a column permutation satisfies $\min_i r_{ii} \leq \bar{r}_{kk} \leq \max_i r_{ii}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Then the conclusions follows from Theorem 2. □

We make some remarks about Theorem 3.

Remark 4: The quantity $r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$ is involved in the conditions. To get some idea about how large it is, we compute it for a few different $d = 2^k - 1$. For $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, the corresponding values of r are 0.83992, 0.69666, 0.57157, 0.46475, 0.37525. They are decreasing with k as proved in Lemma 1. As $d \to \infty$, $r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)) \to r(0) = 0$. Thus, when d is large enough, the condition (42) will be satisfied. By Corollary 1, taking the limit as $d \to \infty$ on both sides of (43), we obtain the following result proved in [9]:

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}),$$

i.e., LLL-P always increases the success probability of the ordinary Babai estimator.

Remark 5: The two conditions (42) and (44) also involve the noise standard deviation σ. When σ is small, (42) is likely to hold, so applying LLL-P is likely to increase P^{BB}, and when σ is large, (44) is likely to hold, so applying

LLL-P is likely to decrease P^{BB}. It is quite surprising that when σ is large enough applying LLL-P will decrease P^{BB}. Thus, before applying LLL-P, one needs to check the conditions (42) and (44). If (42) holds, one has confidence to apply LLL-P. If (44) holds, one should not apply it. If both do not hold, i.e., $\min_i r_{ii}/(2\sigma) < r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)) < \max_i r_{ii}/(2\sigma)$, applying LLL-P may increase or decrease P^{BB}.

B. Effects of SQRD and V-BLAST on P^{BB}

SQRD and V-BLAST have been used to find better ordinary and box-constrained Babai estimators in the literature. It has been demonstrated in [9] that unlike LLL-P, both SQRD and V-BLAST may decrease the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai estimator when the parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is deterministic and not subject to any constraint.

We would like to know how SQRD and V-BLAST affect P^{BB}. Unlike LLL-P, both SQRD and V-BLAST usually involve two non-consecutive columns permutations, resulting in the changes of all diagonal entries between and including the two columns. This makes it very difficult to analyze under which conditions $\boldsymbol{P}^{\text{BB}}$ increases or decreases. We will use numerical test results to show the effects of SQRD and V-BLAST on P^{BB} with explanations.

In Theorem 2 we showed that if the condition (42) holds, then applying LLL-P will increase $\boldsymbol{P}^{\text{BB}}$ and if (44) holds, then applying LLL-P will decrease $\boldsymbol{P}^{\text{BB}}$. The following example shows there are not true for SQRD and V-BLAST.

Example 1: Let $d = 1$ and consider two matrices:

$$\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 3.5 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1.5 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{R}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1.5 & 1.5 \\ 0 & 0.8 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.42 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Applying SQRD, V-BLAST and LLL-P to $\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}$, we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.8028 & -0.8321 & 0 \\ 0 & 3.0509 & 3.4417 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.6364 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 3.1623 & 3.3204 & -0.4743 \\ 0 & 1.1068 & 1.4230 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.7 & -1.7941 & -0.8824 \\ 0 & 0.4556 & -0.1823 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.4338 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}.$$

If $\sigma = 0.2$, then it is easy to verify that for both $\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}$, the condition (42) holds. Simple calculations by using (16) give

$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}) = 0.9876, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}) = 0.8286.$$

Then

$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(1)}) = 0.9442, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(1)}) = P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(1)}) = 0.9910,$$
$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(2)}) = 0.7513, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(2)}) = P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(2)}) = 0.8286.$$

Thus for $\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}$ SQRD decreases P^{BB}, while V-BLAST and LLL-P increase P^{BB} and for $\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}$ V-BLAST decreases P^{BB}, while SQRD and LLL-P keep P^{BB} unchanged.

If $\sigma = 2.2$, then it is easy to verify that for both $\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}$, the condition (44) holds. Simple calculations by using (16) give

$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}) = 0.2738, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}) = 0.1816.$$

Then

$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(1)}) = 0.2777, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(1)}) = P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(1)}) = 0.2700,$$
$$P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{V}^{(2)}) = 0.1898, \quad P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{S}^{(2)}) = P^{\text{BB}}(\boldsymbol{R}_{L}^{(2)}) = 0.1816.$$

Thus for $\boldsymbol{R}^{(1)}$ SQRD increases P^{BB}, while V-BLAST and LLL-P decrease P^{BB} and for $\boldsymbol{R}^{(2)}$ V-BLAST increases P^{BB}, while SQRD and LLL-P keep P^{BB} unchanged.

Although Example 1 indicates that under the condition (42), both SQRD and V-BLAST may decrease P^{BB} unlike LLL-P, often they increase P^{BB}. This is the reason why SQRD and V-BLAST (especially the latter) have often been used to increase the accuracy of the Babai estimator in practice. Example 1 also indicates that under the condition (44), both SQRD and V-BLAST may increase P^{BB} unlike LLL-P, but often they decrease P^{BB}. This is the opposite of what we commonly believe. Later we give numerical test results to show both phenomenons. In the following we give some explanations.

It is easy to show that like LLL-P, V-BLAST increases $\min_i r_{ii}$ after each permutation and like LLL-P, SQRD decreases $\max_i r_{ii}$ after each permutation, see [13], [24]. For the relation between V-BLAST and SQRD, see, e.g., [8] and [24]. Thus if the condition (42) holds before applying V-BLAST, it will also hold after applying it; and if the condition (44) holds before applying SQRD, it will also hold after applying it. Often applying V-BLAST decreases $\max_i r_{ii}$ and applying SQRD increases $\min_i r_{ii}$ (both may not be true sometimes, see Example 1). Thus often the gaps between the large diagonal entries and the small ones of $\boldsymbol{R}$ decrease after applying SQRD or V-BLAST. From the proof of Theorem 2 we see reducing the gaps will likely increase P^{BB} under the condition (42) and decrease P^{BB} under the condition (44). Thus it is likely both SQRD and V-BLAST will increase P^{BB} under (42) and decrease it under (44). We will give further explanations in the next subsection.

C. A bound on P^{BB}

In this subsection we give a bound on P^{BB}, which is an upper bound under one condition and becomes a lower bound under an opposite condition. This bound can help us to understand what a column permutation strategy should try to achieve.

Theorem 4: Suppose the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold. Let the box $\mathcal{B}$ in (1b) be a cube with edge length of d and denote $\gamma = (\det(\boldsymbol{R}))^{1/n}$.

1) If the condition (42) holds, then

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq \Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(\gamma)\Big]^n. \tag{46}$$

2) If the condition (44) holds, then

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{BB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \geq \Big[\frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{d+1}\phi_\sigma(\gamma)\Big]^n. \tag{47}$$

The equality in either (46)or (47) holds if and only if $r_{ii} = \gamma$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Proof. We prove only part 1. Part 2 can be proved similarly. Note that $\gamma^n = \Pi_{i=1}^n r_{ii}$. Obviously, if $r_{ii} = \gamma$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then by (16) the equality in (46) holds. In the following we assume there exist j and k such that $r_{jj} \neq r_{kk}$, we only need to show that the strict inequality (46) holds.

Denote $F(\zeta) = \ln(1 + d\phi_\sigma(\exp(\zeta)))$, $\eta_i = \ln(r_{ii})$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $\eta = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i$. It is easy to see that (46) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n F(\eta_i) < F(\eta).$$

Since $\min_i r_{ii} \geq 2\sigma r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$ and $r_{jj} \neq r_{kk}$, it suffices to show that $F(\zeta)$ is a strict concave function on $(\ln(2\sigma r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))), +\infty)$. Therefore, we only need to show that $F''(\zeta) < 0$ when $\zeta > \ln(2\sigma r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)))$.

To simplify notation, denote $\xi = \exp(\zeta)/(2\sigma)$. Simple calculations give

$$F'(\zeta) = \frac{\xi \exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^2\big)}{\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d} + \int_0^\xi \exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\big)dt}.$$

Using (27), we obtain

$$F''(\zeta) = \frac{\xi \exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^2\big)}{(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d} + \int_0^\xi \exp\big(-\frac{1}{2}t^2\big)dt)^2} f\Big(\xi, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2d}\Big).$$

When $\zeta > \ln(2\sigma r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)))$, $\xi > r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d))$. Thus, by Lemma 1, $f(\xi, \sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)) < 0$. Then we can conclude that $F''(\zeta) < 0$ when $\zeta > \ln(2\sigma r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)))$, completing the proof. □

Now we make some remarks about Theorem 4.

Remark 6: The quantity γ is invariant with respect to column permutations, i.e., for $\boldsymbol{R}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ in (7), we have the same γ no matter what the permutation matrix $\boldsymbol{P}$ is. Thus the bounds in (46) and (47), which are actually the same quantity, are invariant with respect to column permutations. Although the condition (42) is variant with respect to column permutations, if it holds before applying LLL-P or V-BLAST, it will hold afterwards, since the minimum of the diagonal entries of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ will not be smaller than that of $\boldsymbol{R}$ after applying LLL-P or V-BLAST. Similarly, the condition (44) is also variant with respect to column permutations. But if it holds before applying LLL-P or SQRD, it will hold afterwards, since the maximum of the diagonal entries of $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ will not be larger than that of $\boldsymbol{R}$ after applying LLL-P or SQRD.

Remark 7: The bounds (46) and (47) are reached if all the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$ are identical. This suggests that if the gaps between the larger entries and small entries become smaller after permutations, it is likely that P^{BB} increases under the condition (42) or decreases under the condition (44). As we know, the gap between the largest one and the smallest one decreases after applying LLL-P. Numerical tests indicate usually this is also true for both V-BLAST and SQRD. Thus both V-BLAST and SQRD will likely bring P^{BB} closer to the bound under the two opposite conditions, respectively.

Remark 8: When $d \to \infty$, by Lemma 1, $r(\sqrt{2\pi}/(2d)) \to 0$, thus the condition in part 1 of Theorem 4 becomes $\max_i r_{ii} \geq 0$, which certainly holds always. Taking the limit as $d \to \infty$ on both sides of (46) and using Corollary 1, we obtain

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq (\phi_\sigma(\gamma))^n. \tag{48}$$

The above result was obtained in [33] and a simple proof was provided in [9].

D. Numerical tests

We have shown in Theorem 3 that if (42) holds, then the LLL-P increases P^{BB} and (46) is an upper bound on P^{BB}; and if (44) holds, then the LLL-P decreases P^{BB} and (47) is a lower bound on P^{BB}. Example 1 shows that this conclusion does not always hold for SQRD and V-BLAST. To further understand the effects of the LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST on P^{BB} and to see how close they bring their corresponding P^{BB} to the bounds given by (46) and (47), we performed some numerical tests. For comparisons, we also performed tests for P^{OB}.

We performed MATLAB tests for the following two cases.

- Case 1. $\boldsymbol{A} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\text{randn}(n,n)$, where randn$(n,n)$ is a MATLAB built-in function to generate a random $n \times n$ matrix, whose entries follow the i.i.d normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. So the elements of $\boldsymbol{A}$ follow the i.i.d normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,1/2)$.
- Case 2. $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{V}^T$, $\boldsymbol{U}, \boldsymbol{V}$ are random orthogonal matrices obtained by the QR factorization of random matrices generated by randn(n,n) and $\boldsymbol{D}$ is a $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with $d_{ii} = 10^{3(n/2-i)/(n-1)}$. The condition number of $\boldsymbol{A}$ is 1000.

In the tests for each case, we first chose $n = 4$ and $\mathcal{B} = [0,1]^4$ and took different noise standard deviation σ to test different situations according to the conditions (42) and (44) imposed in Theorems 3 and 4. The edge length d of $\mathcal{B}$ is equal to 1. So in (42) and (44), $r(\sqrt{2\pi}/2d) = r(\sqrt{2\pi}/2) = 0.83992$. Details about choosing σ will be given later.

We use P^{BB}, P_{L}^{BB}, P_{S}^{BB} and P_{V}^{BB} respectively denote the success probability of the box-constrained Babai estimator corresponding to QR factorization (i.e., no permutations are involved), LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST. Let μ^{BB} denote the right-hand side of (46) or (47), so it is an upper bound if (42) holds and a lower bound if (44) holds. Similarly, P^{OB}, P_{L}^{OB}, P_{S}^{OB} and P_{V}^{OB} respectively denote the success probability of the ordinary Babai estimator corresponding to QR factorization, LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST. We use μ^{OB} to denote the right-hand side of (48), which is an upper bound on P^{OB}, P_{L}^{OB}, P_{S}^{OB} and P_{V}^{OB}. For each case, we performed 10 runs (notice that for each run we have different $\boldsymbol{A}$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ due to randomness) and the results are displayed in Tables I-VI.

In Tables I and II, $\sigma = \sigma_1 \equiv \min(r_{ii})/1.8$. It is easy to verify that the condition (42) holds. This means that in theory $P^{\text{BB}} \leq P_{\text{L}}^{\text{BB}}$ by Theorem 3 and $P^{\text{BB}}, P_{\text{L}}^{\text{BB}}, P_{\text{V}}^{\text{BB}} \leq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ by Theorem 4 and Remark 6. The numerical results given in Tables I and II are consistent with the theoretical results. The numerical results also indicate that SQRD and V-BLAST (nonstrictly) increase P^{BB}, although there is one exceptional case for SQRD in Table II. We observe that the permutation strategies increase P^{BB} more significantly for Case 2 than for Case 1. The reason is that $\boldsymbol{A}$ is more ill-conditioned for Case 2, resulting in bigger gaps between the diagonal entries of $\boldsymbol{R}$, which can usually be reduced more effectively by the permutation strategies. We also observe that $P_{\text{S}}^{\text{BB}} \leq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ in both tables. Although in theory the inequality may not hold as we cannot guarantee the condition (42) holds after applying SQRD, usually SQRD can make $\min_i r_{ii}$ larger. Thus if (42) holds before applying SQRD, it is likely the condition still holds after applying it. Thus it is likely $P_{\text{S}}^{\text{BB}} \leq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ holds.

Tables III and IV are opposite to Tables I and II. In both tables, $\sigma = \sigma_2 \equiv \max(r_{ii})/1.6$, then the condition (44) holds. This means that in theory $P^{\text{BB}} \geq P_{\text{L}}^{\text{BB}}$ by Theorem 3 and $P^{\text{BB}}, P_{\text{L}}^{\text{BB}}, P_{\text{S}}^{\text{BB}} \geq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ by Theorem 4 and Remark 6. The numerical results given in the two tables are consistent with the theoretical results. The results in the two tables also indicate that both SQRD and V-BLAST (nonstrictly) decrease P^{BB}, although Example 1 shows that neither is always true under the condition (44). We also observe that $P_{\text{V}}^{\text{BB}} \geq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ in both tables. Although in theory the inequality may not hold as we cannot guarantee the condition (44) holds after applying V-BLAST, usually V-BLAST can make $\max_i r_{ii}$ smaller. Thus if (44) holds before applying V-BLAST, it is likely the condition still holds after applying it. Thus it is likely $P_{\text{V}}^{\text{BB}} \geq \mu^{\text{BB}}$ holds.

In Tables V and VI, $\sigma = \sigma_3 \equiv (0.3\max(r_{ii}) + 0.7\min(r_{ii}))/1.68$. It is easy to verify that neither (42) (almost) nor (44) holds in theory. In theory we do not have results cover this situation. The numerical results in the two tables indicate all of the three permutation strategies can either increase or decrease P^{BB} and μ^{BB} can be larger or smaller than P^{BB}, P_L^{BB}, P_S^{BB} and P_V^{BB}. The reason we chose 0.3 and 0.7 rather than a more natural choice of 0.5 and 0.5 in defining σ here is that we may not be able to observe both increasing and decreasing phenomenons due to limited runs.

Now we make comments on the success probability of ordinary Babai points. From Tables I-VI, we observe that LLL-P always (nonstrictly) increases P^{OB}, and SQRD and V-BLAST almost always increases P^{OB} (there is one exceptional case for SQRD in Table II and two exceptional cases for V-BLAST in Table VI). Thus the ordinary case is different from the box-constrained case. We also observe $P^{\text{OB}} \leq P^{\text{BB}}$ for the same permutation strategies. Sometimes the difference between the two is large (see Tables IV and VI).

Each of Tables I-VI displays the results for only 10 runs due to space limitation. To make up for this shortcoming, we give Tables VII and VIII, which display some statistics for 1000 runs on the data generated exactly the same way as the data for the 10 runs. Specifically these two tables display the number of runs, in which P^{BB} (P^{OB}) increases, keeps unchanged and decreases after each of the three permutation strategies is applied for Case 1 and Case 2, respectively. In the two tables, σ_1, σ_2 and σ_3 are defined in the same as those used in Tables I–VI.

From Tables VII and VIII, we can see that often these permutation strategies increase or decrease P^{BB} for the same data. The numerical results given in all the tables suggest that if the condition (42) holds, we should have confidence to use any of these permutation strategies; and if the condition (44) holds we should not use any of them.

TABLE I
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 1, $\sigma = \min(r_{ii})/1.8$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
0.0738	0.8159	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.6319	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
0.1537	0.7632	0.8423	0.8423	0.8423	0.9083	0.5503	0.6988	0.6988	0.6988	0.8231
0.1575	0.7938	0.9491	0.9491	0.9491	0.9698	0.5977	0.8998	0.8998	0.8998	0.9403
0.2170	0.7235	0.8577	0.8577	0.8577	0.8670	0.4893	0.7300	0.7300	0.7300	0.7477
0.1285	0.8133	0.8534	0.8534	0.8521	0.9882	0.6278	0.7070	0.7070	0.7049	0.9766
0.1676	0.6809	0.7529	0.7529	0.7529	0.8896	0.4255	0.5375	0.5375	0.5375	0.7885
0.3665	0.7039	0.7273	0.7273	0.7273	0.8004	0.4629	0.5093	0.5093	0.5093	0.6324
0.1968	0.6892	0.7320	0.7320	0.7385	0.8073	0.4420	0.5103	0.5103	0.5270	0.6439
0.3322	0.7087	0.7317	0.7317	0.7317	0.7665	0.4718	0.5156	0.5156	0.5156	0.5765
0.5221	0.4754	0.4754	0.4754	0.4754	0.4758	0.1899	0.1899	0.1899	0.1899	0.1910

TABLE II
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 2, $\sigma = \min(r_{ii})/1.8$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
0.0101	0.8155	0.9452	0.9354	0.9452	1.0000	0.6312	0.8905	0.8708	0.8905	1.0000
0.0130	0.7983	0.9839	0.9839	0.9839	1.0000	0.6045	0.9679	0.9679	0.9679	1.0000
0.0173	0.8159	0.9793	0.9793	0.9793	1.0000	0.6319	0.9586	0.9586	0.9586	1.0000
0.0066	0.8159	0.9913	0.9913	0.9967	1.0000	0.6319	0.9826	0.9826	0.9933	1.0000
0.0177	0.8106	0.9998	0.9998	0.9998	1.0000	0.6236	0.9997	0.9997	0.9997	1.0000
0.0060	0.8159	0.9841	0.9841	0.9998	1.0000	0.6319	0.9681	0.9681	0.9996	1.0000
0.0168	0.7833	0.8098	0.7625	0.8159	1.0000	0.5813	0.6224	0.5250	0.6319	1.0000
0.0150	0.8159	0.9999	0.9999	0.9999	1.0000	0.6319	0.9998	0.9998	0.9998	1.0000
0.0231	0.8159	0.9999	0.9999	0.9999	1.0000	0.6319	0.9999	0.9999	0.9999	1.0000
0.0211	0.7912	0.9696	0.9696	0.9892	1.0000	0.5935	0.9393	0.9393	0.9784	1.0000

TABLE III
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 1, $\sigma = \max(r_{ii})/1.6$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
1.1726	0.1557	0.1310	0.1310	0.1380	0.1121	0.0005	0.0006	0.0006	0.0006	0.0006
0.6432	0.2756	0.2756	0.2756	0.2756	0.2731	0.0387	0.0387	0.0387	0.0387	0.0395
0.5962	0.2915	0.2912	0.2912	0.2909	0.2900	0.0472	0.0473	0.0473	0.0475	0.0478
1.2435	0.1875	0.1632	0.1673	0.1632	0.1571	0.0040	0.0044	0.0044	0.0044	0.0045
0.8332	0.1873	0.1769	0.1769	0.1769	0.1750	0.0070	0.0074	0.0074	0.0074	0.0074
0.4875	0.2709	0.2709	0.2709	0.2709	0.2667	0.0356	0.0356	0.0356	0.0356	0.0366
0.9684	0.2769	0.2709	0.2709	0.2709	0.2688	0.0358	0.0369	0.0369	0.0369	0.0375
0.9971	0.1846	0.1665	0.1665	0.1665	0.1588	0.0043	0.0046	0.0046	0.0046	0.0047
1.2791	0.1501	0.1308	0.1308	0.1308	0.1294	0.0015	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016
0.6327	0.2641	0.2564	0.2564	0.2564	0.2556	0.0301	0.0316	0.0316	0.0316	0.0318

TABLE IV
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 2, $\sigma = \max(r_{ii})/1.6$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
3.9438	0.1064	0.0947	0.0987	0.0947	0.0709	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2.4510	0.1173	0.1173	0.1173	0.1173	0.0764	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
0.5790	0.1788	0.1640	0.1640	0.1640	0.1363	0.0019	0.0019	0.0019	0.0019	0.0021
5.3809	0.1011	0.0701	0.0701	0.0701	0.0686	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2.2574	0.1140	0.1023	0.0954	0.0954	0.0777	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
3.7623	0.1099	0.0801	0.0801	0.0757	0.0713	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
3.9225	0.1063	0.0834	0.0834	0.0834	0.0709	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
1.3198	0.1153	0.1153	0.1153	0.1153	0.0900	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
1.2416	0.1394	0.1108	0.1108	0.1108	0.0920	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
0.8411	0.1719	0.1532	0.1532	0.1532	0.1090	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005

TABLE V
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 1, $\sigma = (0.3\max(r_{ii}) + 0.7\min(r_{ii}))/1.68$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
0.2848	0.4208	0.4336	0.4336	0.3184	0.2846	0.0154	0.0165	0.0165	0.0252	0.0451
0.6313	0.4720	0.4829	0.4829	0.4829	0.4863	0.1630	0.1932	0.1932	0.1932	0.2017
0.4328	0.4540	0.4599	0.4599	0.4599	0.4623	0.1517	0.1673	0.1673	0.1673	0.1776
0.6105	0.5054	0.5061	0.5061	0.5061	0.5092	0.2123	0.2161	0.2161	0.2161	0.2259
0.3306	0.4268	0.3807	0.3807	0.3805	0.3484	0.0321	0.0539	0.0539	0.0539	0.0829
0.2600	0.5055	0.5103	0.5103	0.5103	0.5252	0.1544	0.1868	0.1868	0.1868	0.2437
0.4743	0.4235	0.4283	0.4283	0.4283	0.4259	0.0631	0.1225	0.1225	0.1225	0.1437
0.5878	0.4104	0.4161	0.4161	0.4161	0.4170	0.1159	0.1304	0.1304	0.1304	0.1359
0.3977	0.4429	0.4431	0.4431	0.4431	0.4477	0.1477	0.1479	0.1479	0.1479	0.1636
0.6273	0.4684	0.4684	0.4684	0.4684	0.4696	0.1792	0.1792	0.1792	0.1792	0.1848

TABLE VI
SUCCESS PROBABILITIES AND BOUNDS FOR CASE 2, $\sigma = (0.3\max(r_{ii}) + 0.7\min(r_{ii}))/1.68$

σ	P^{BB}	P_L^{BB}	P_S^{BB}	P_V^{BB}	μ^{BB}	P^{OB}	P_L^{OB}	P_S^{OB}	P_V^{OB}	μ^{OB}
1.0377	0.1608	0.1324	0.1324	0.1625	0.0987	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002
0.3648	0.2774	0.2774	0.2774	0.2405	0.1987	0.0034	0.0034	0.0034	0.0025	0.0126
0.7603	0.1681	0.1758	0.1758	0.1758	0.1150	0.0003	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0007
0.8769	0.1835	0.2062	0.1713	0.2062	0.1067	0.0002	0.0003	0.0004	0.0003	0.0004
0.4708	0.2794	0.2352	0.2352	0.2352	0.1590	0.0010	0.0030	0.0030	0.0030	0.0048
1.1983	0.1572	0.1319	0.1319	0.1319	0.0932	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
1.0001	0.1758	0.1596	0.1596	0.1464	0.1003	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0001	0.0002
0.8523	0.1671	0.1733	0.1733	0.1715	0.1082	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0005
0.2128	0.3478	0.3478	0.3728	0.3478	0.3539	0.0599	0.0599	0.0711	0.0599	0.0866
0.3956	0.2188	0.2117	0.2117	0.1973	0.1844	0.0047	0.0047	0.0047	0.0034	0.0093

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF RUNS OUT OF 1000 IN WHICH P^{BB} AND P^{OB} CHANGE FOR CASE 1

		P^{BB}			P^{OB}		
σ	Strategy / Result	LLL-P	SQRD	V-BLAST	LLL-P	SQRD	V-BLAST
σ_1	Increase	933	928	951	933	922	953
	No change	67	47	42	67	47	42
	Decrease	0	25	7	0	31	5
σ_2	Increase	0	25	6	942	947	950
	No change	58	40	37	58	40	37
	Decrease	942	935	957	0	13	13
σ_3	Increase	781	797	740	942	945	952
	No change	58	40	37	58	40	37
	Decrease	161	163	223	0	15	11

TABLE VIII
NUMBER OF RUNS OUT OF 1000 IN WHICH P^{BB} AND P^{OB} CHANGE FOR CASE 2

		P^{BB}			P^{OB}		
σ	Strategy / Result	LLL-P	SQRD	V-BLAST	LLL-P	SQRD	V-BLAST
σ_1	Increase	858	803	938	858	800	938
	No change	142	76	56	142	76	56
	Decrease	0	121	6	0	124	6
σ_2	Increase	0	23	69	906	944	831
	No change	94	46	48	94	46	48
	Decrease	906	931	883	0	10	121
σ_3	Increase	134	189	97	906	943	840
	No change	94	46	48	94	46	48
	Decrease	772	765	855	0	11	112

Tables VII and VIII do not show which permutation strategy can increase P^{BB} most. The information on this given in Tables I and VI are limited. In the following we give more test results to investigate this.

We still consider Cases 1 and 2, but we take $\mathcal{B} = [0, 15]^n$ and choose different n and σ from before. In Figures 1 and 2 for $n = 20$, we take $\sigma = 0.1 : 0.1 : 0.8$ and $\sigma = 0.01 : 0.01 : 0.08$ for Cases 1 and 2, respectively. For each σ, we give 200 runs to generate 200 different $\boldsymbol{A}$'s. These two figures display the average P^{BB} corresponding to QR, LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST over 200 runs for Cases 1 and 2, respectively. Figures 3 and 4 display the average P^{BB} corresponding to the various permutation strategies over 200 runs versus $n = 5 : 5 : 40$ with $\sigma = 0.4$ and $\sigma = 0.04$ for Cases 1 and 2, respectively. The reason we choose different σ for the two cases is to ensure P^{BB} is neither close to 0 nor close to 1; otherwise, it is not much interesting to investigate the effects of the column permutations on P^{BB}.

From Figures 1-4, we can see that on average all of the three column permutation strategies improve P^{BB}. The effect of V-BLAST is much more significantly than that of LLL-P and SQRD, which have more or less the same performance. This phenomenon is similar to that for P^{OB}, as shown in [9].



Fig. 1. Average success probabilities over 200 runs versus σ for Case 1, $n = 20$

V. ON THE CONJECTURE PROPOSED IN [27]

In [27], a conjecture was made on the ordinary Babai estimator, based on which a stopping criterion was then proposed for the sphere decoding search process for solving the BILS problem (2). In this section, we first introduce this conjecture, then give an example to show that this conjecture may not hold in general, and finally we show that the conjecture holds under some conditions.

The problem considered in [27] is to estimate the integer parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ in the box-constrained linear model (1). The method proposed in [27] first ignores the box constraint (1b). Instead of using the column permutations in (7), it performs the LLL reduction:

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{Z} = \bar{\boldsymbol{R}} \tag{49}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ is orthogonal, $\boldsymbol{Z}$ is unimodular (i.e, $\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n\times n}$ and $\det(\boldsymbol{Z}) = \pm 1$) and the upper triangular $\bar{\boldsymbol{R}}$ is LLL reduced, i.e., it satisfies the Lovász condition (8) and the size-reduce condition: $|\bar{r}_{ik}| \leq \frac{1}{2}\bar{r}_{ii}$ for $k = i+1, i+2, \ldots, n$



Fig. 2. Average success probabilities over 200 runs versus σ for Case 2, $n = 20$



Fig. 3. Average success probabilities over 200 runs versus n for Case 1, $\sigma = 0.4$



Fig. 4. Average success probabilities over 200 runs versus n for Case 2, $\sigma = 0.04$

and $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. Then, with $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}} = \boldsymbol{Z}^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$, the ordinary linear model (5a) becomes

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{y}} = \bar{\boldsymbol{R}}\hat{\boldsymbol{z}} + \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{v}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}). \tag{50}$$

For the reduced model, one can find its ordinary Babai estimator $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$ (c.f. (15)):

$$c_i^{\text{OB}} = (\bar{y}_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \bar{r}_{ij} z_j^{\text{OB}})/\bar{r}_{ii}, \quad z_i^{\text{OB}} = \lfloor c_i^{\text{OB}} \rceil \tag{51}$$

for $i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$. Define $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$. In [27], $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is used as an estimator of the true parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$. If $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$, then a vector error (VE) is said to have occurred. Note that $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ may be outside the constraint box $\mathcal{B}$ in (1b). If $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is called a valid vector, otherwise, i.e., $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \notin \mathcal{B}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is called an invalid vector. The conjecture proposed in [27] is: a VE is most likely to occur if $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is invalid; conversely, if $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is valid, there is little chance that the vector is in error.

From the definition of VE, if $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is invalid, then VE must occur. So in the following, we will only consider the second part of the conjecture, i.e., $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \approx 0$.

A. The conjecture does not always hold

In this subsection, we first show that $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$ can be very close to 1, then give a specific example to show $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \geq 0.9275$ and at last perform some Matlab simulations to illustrate this example.

Theorem 5: For any given $\epsilon > 0$, any fixed dimension $n \geq 2$, any box $\mathcal{B}$ and any standard deviation σ of the noise vector $\boldsymbol{v}$, there always exists a box-constrained linear model in the form of (5), where $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the box $\mathcal{B}$, such that

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} - \epsilon. \tag{52}$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) &= \frac{\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) - \Pr((\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \cap (\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}))}{\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}})}{\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})}. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Thus, to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that there exists a box-constrained linear model such that

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq \Big(\frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} + \epsilon\Big) \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}). \tag{54}$$

For any fixed σ, box $\mathcal{B}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $r_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\phi_\sigma(r_{11}) \leq \Big(\frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} + \epsilon\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{2(u_1 - l_1 + 1)} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} [\phi_\sigma((2u_1 - 2l_1 - 2i + 1)r_{11}) + \phi_\sigma((2i+1)r_{11})]\Big) \tag{55}$$

where $\phi_\sigma(\cdot)$ is defined in (18). In fact, for any fixed σ, it is easy to verify by L'Höpital's rule that

$$\lim_{r_{11} \to 0} \frac{\phi_\sigma(r_{11})}{\frac{1}{2(u_1 - l_1 + 1)} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} [\phi_\sigma((2u_1 - 2l_1 - 2i + 1)r_{11}) + \phi_\sigma((2i+1)r_{11})]} = \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1}.$$

Therefore, there exists $r_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that (55) holds.

To construct the linear model, we need only to construct a matrix $\boldsymbol{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. With r_{11} satisfying (55), take r_{22} such that $r_{22} \geq r_{11}$ and define

$$\boldsymbol{R} = \begin{bmatrix} r_{11} & 0.5 r_{11} \boldsymbol{e}^T \\ \boldsymbol{0} & r_{22} \boldsymbol{I}_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e} = [1, \ldots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. For the resulting linear model, in the following we show that (54) holds.

Note that $\boldsymbol{R}$ is already LLL reduced, thus, $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$. Then, by (17), the left-hand side of (54) satisfies

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \phi_\sigma(r_{11}) \phi_\sigma^{n-1}(r_{22}). \tag{56}$$

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) = \Pr(\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{B}) &\geq \Pr\left(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] \bigcap (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\right) \\ &= \Pr\big(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \cdot \Pr\big(\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i)\big) \\ &= \Pr\big(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \phi_\sigma^{n-1}(r_{22}) \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where the last equality follows from (17). Therefore, by (56) and (57), to show (54) it suffices to show

$$\phi_\sigma(r_{11}) \leq \Big(\frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} + \epsilon\Big) \Pr(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))).$$

Then, by (55), it suffices to show

$$\Pr(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))) = \frac{1}{2(u_1 - l_1 + 1)} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} [\phi_\sigma((2u_1 - 2l_1 - 2i + 1)r_{11}) + \phi_\sigma((2i+1)r_{11})]. \tag{58}$$

From the proof for Theorem 1, we see that if $x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i$ for $i = n, n-1, \ldots, 2$ and $\hat{x}_1$ is fixed, then $c_1^{\text{OB}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{x}_1, \sigma^2/r_{11}^2)$. Since $x_1^{\text{OB}} = \lfloor c_1^{\text{OB}} \rceil$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the box $\mathcal{B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr\big(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \\ =& \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} \Pr\big(\hat{x}_1 = l_1 + i, x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \\ =& \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} \Pr(\hat{x}_1 = l_1 + i) \Pr\big(x_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1, u_1] | (\hat{x}_1 = l_1 + i) \cap (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \\ =& \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} \Pr\big(c_1^{\text{OB}} \in [l_1 - 1/2, u_1 + 1/2] | (\hat{x}_1 = l_1 + i) \cap (\cap_{i=2}^{n}(x_i^{\text{OB}} = \hat{x}_i))\big) \\ =& \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma/r_{11}} \int_{l_1 - 1/2}^{u_1 + 1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{(t - l_1 - i)^2}{2\sigma^2/r_{11}^2}\right) dt \\ =& \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-(2i+1)r_{11}/(2\sigma)}^{(2u_1 - 2l_1 - 2i + 1)r_{11}/(2\sigma)} \exp(-t^2/2) dt \\ =& \frac{1}{2(u_1 - l_1 + 1)} \sum_{i=0}^{u_1 - l_1} [\phi_\sigma((2u_1 - 2l_1 - 2i + 1)r_{11}) + \phi_\sigma((2i+1)r_{11})] \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (22). Therefore, (58) holds, and this completes the proof. □

As $u_1 - l_1 + 1$ is at least 2, Theorem 5 shows that $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$ can be at least $1/2 - \epsilon$ and can be very close to 1. In the following, we give a specific example to show that $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \geq 0.9275$ and give some simulation results.

Example 2: For any fixed n and σ, let $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\mathcal{B} = [0, 15]^n$, and define

$$\boldsymbol{R} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.04\sigma & 0.02\sigma \boldsymbol{e}^T \\ \boldsymbol{0} & 10\sigma \boldsymbol{I}_{n-1,n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{59}$$

It is easy to verify that this matrix $\boldsymbol{R}$ satisfies the requirements given in the proof of Theorem 5. Then by (52), we have $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \geq 0.9275$.

We use MATLAB to do some simulations to illustrate the probability. In the simulations, for any fixed n and σ, we generated an $n \times n$ matrix $\boldsymbol{R}$ by using (59). After fixing $\boldsymbol{R}$, we gave 10000 runs to generate 10000 $\tilde{\boldsymbol{v}}$'s and 10000 $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$'s according to their distributions, producing 10000 $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}$'s according to (5a). For each $\tilde{\boldsymbol{y}}$, we found the Babai point $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ by using (15). For each pair of $\boldsymbol{R}$ and σ, we computed the theoretical probability $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}})$ denoted by P_{th} by using (56) (notice that $P_{th} = P^{\text{OB}}$ since $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{x}^{\text{OB}}$ here) and the corresponding experimental probability P_{ex} (i.e., the ratio of the number of runs in which $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ to 10000). We also computed the experimental probability P_b of $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}$ (i.e., the ratio of the number of runs in which $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}$ to 10000) and the experimental probability P_e corresponding to $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$ (i.e., $P_e = 1 - P_{ex}/P_b$).

Tables IX and X respectively display those probabilities versus $n = 5 : 5 : 40$ with $\sigma = 0.1$ and versus $\sigma = 0.1 : 0.1 : 0.8$ with $n = 20$. From these two tables, we can see that the values of P_e are larger than 0.9275 except the

case that $n = 40$ in Table IX, in which P_e is smaller than 0.9275, but it is close to the latter. Thus the test results are consistent with the theoretical result. We also observe that P_{th} is very small and P_{ex} is a good approximation to P_{th}. In Tables IX the values of P_{th} are actually different, but very close because $\phi_\sigma(r_{22})$ is very close to 1 (c.f. (56)) and in Tables X the values of P_{th} are exactly equal because in (56) $\phi(r_{11})$ and $\phi_\sigma(r_{22})$ are independent of σ. This experiment confirms that even if $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is valid, there may be a large chance that it is in error.

TABLE IX
PROBABILITY VERSUS $n = 5 : 5 : 40$ WITH $\sigma = 0.1$

$\boldsymbol{n}$	P_{th}	P_{ex}	P_b	P_e
5	0.0160	0.0160	0.2484	0.9356
10	0.0160	0.0150	0.2485	0.9396
15	0.0160	0.0164	0.2469	0.9336
20	0.0160	0.0163	0.2499	0.9348
25	0.0160	0.0173	0.2564	0.9325
30	0.0160	0.0172	0.2500	0.9312
35	0.0160	0.0172	0.2473	0.9304
40	0.0160	0.0182	0.2434	0.9252

TABLE X
PROBABILITY VERSUS $\sigma = 0.1 : 0.1 : 0.8$ WITH $n = 20$

σ	P_{th}	P_{ex}	P_b	P_e
0.1	0.0160	0.0159	0.2503	0.9365
0.2	0.0160	0.0168	0.2522	0.9334
0.3	0.0160	0.0156	0.2434	0.9359
0.4	0.0160	0.0156	0.2399	0.9350
0.5	0.0160	0.0175	0.2435	0.9281
0.6	0.0160	0.0173	0.2475	0.9301
0.7	0.0160	0.0157	0.2541	0.9382
0.8	0.0160	0.0162	0.2517	0.9356

B. The conjecture holds under some conditions

In this subsection, we will show that the conjecture holds under some conditions.

Recall $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$, thus $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}})$. Then, by (53), we have

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \leq 1 - \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}). \tag{60}$$

So, if $\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}) \approx 1$, then the conjecture holds. From Corollary 2 we see that when σ is small enough, we have $\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}) \approx 1$. But the upper bound given in (60) is not sharp because it was derived from (53) by using the inequality $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \leq 1$. We will give a sharper upper bound on $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$ based on a sharper upper bound on $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$.

Since $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{E} \equiv \{\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1}\boldsymbol{s} \,|\, \forall \boldsymbol{s} \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Thus $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) = \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{E})$. But the set $\mathcal{E}$ is a parallelotope and it is difficult to analyze $\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{E})$. Thus in the following we will give a box $\mathcal{F}$ to include $\mathcal{E}$, then we analyze $\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{F})$. Let $\boldsymbol{U} = (u_{ij}) = \boldsymbol{Z}^{-1}$ and define for $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$,

$$\mu_{ij} = \begin{cases} l_j, & \text{if } \ u_{ij} \geq 0 \\ u_j, & \text{if } \ u_{ij} < 0 \end{cases}, \quad \nu_{ij} = \begin{cases} u_j, & \text{if } \ u_{ij} \geq 0 \\ l_j, & \text{if } \ u_{ij} < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Then define $\bar{\boldsymbol{l}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ as follows:

$$\bar{l}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{ij}\mu_{ij}, \quad \bar{u}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{ij}\mu_{ij}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{61}$$

It is easy to observe that

$$\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \equiv \{\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \bar{\boldsymbol{l}} \leq \boldsymbol{z} \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}\}. \tag{62}$$

Actually it is easy to observe that $\mathcal{F}$ is the smallest box including $\mathcal{E}$.

With the above preparation, we now give the following result.

Theorem 6: Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold and the linear model (5a) is transformed to the linear model (50) through the LLL reduction (49). Then the estimator $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}$ defined as $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$ satisfies

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \leq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\phi_\sigma(\bar{r}_{ii})}{\phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_i - \bar{l}_i + 1)\bar{r}_{ii})} \tag{63}$$

where ϕ_σ is defined in (18) and $\bar{\boldsymbol{l}}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}$ are defined in (61).

Proof. Since $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) = \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{E})$, it follows from (62) that

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \leq \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{F}). \tag{64}$$

In the following, we will show

$$\Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} \in \mathcal{F}) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_i - \bar{l}_i + 1)\bar{r}_{ii}). \tag{65}$$

Then combining (64), (65) and the fact that $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) = \Pr(\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \phi_\sigma(\bar{r}_{ii})$, we can conclude (63) holds from (53).

To show (65), instead of analyzing the probability of $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$ on its left-hand side, we will analyze an equivalent probability of $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ as we know the distribution of $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$.

In our proof, we need to use the basic result: given $v \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and $\eta > 0$, for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Pr(v \in [\zeta, \zeta + \eta]) \leq \Pr(v \in [-\eta/2, \eta/2]) = \phi_\sigma(\eta). \tag{66}$$

By (18), the equality in (66) obviously holds. To prove the inequality, let

$$q(\zeta) = \int_{\zeta}^{\zeta+\eta} \exp\big(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\big) dt.$$

Thus the inequality can be written as $q(\zeta) \leq q(-\eta/2)$. We can easily show that $q'(-\eta/2) = 0$, $q'(\zeta) > 0$ if $\zeta < -\eta/2$ and $q'(\zeta) < 0$ if $\zeta > -\eta/2$. Thus, the inequality holds.

From (50) and (51), we observe that $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}$ is a function of $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$. To emphasize this, we write it as $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}})$. When $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ changes, $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}})$ may change too. In the following analysis, we assume that $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$ is fixed and $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ satisfies the model (50).

For later uses, for $= n, n-1, \ldots, 1$, define

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \{\boldsymbol{w}_{i:n} | \, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{i:n} = \bar{\boldsymbol{R}}_{i:n,i:n}\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}_{i:n} + \boldsymbol{w}_{i:n},\, z_k^{\text{OB}}(\boldsymbol{w}_{i:n}) \in [\bar{l}_k, \bar{u}_k],\, k = i, i+1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{67}$$

From (67), it is easy to verify that $\boldsymbol{z}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}) \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}} \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Therefore, (65) is equivalent to

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{1:n} \in \mathcal{G}_1) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_i - \bar{l}_i + 1)\bar{r}_{ii}). \tag{68}$$

We prove (68) by induction. First, we prove the base case:

$$\Pr(\bar{v}_n \in \mathcal{G}_n) \leq \sigma((\bar{u}_n - \bar{l}_n + 1)\bar{r}_{nn}).$$

By (51) and (50), we have

$$c_n^{\text{OB}} = \frac{\bar{y}_n}{\bar{r}_{nn}} = \frac{\bar{r}_{nn}\hat{z}_n + \bar{v}_n}{\bar{r}_{nn}} = \hat{z}_n + \frac{\bar{v}_n}{\bar{r}_{nn}}.$$

Since $z_n^{\text{OB}}(\bar{v}_n) = \lfloor c_n^{\text{OB}} \rceil$, by (67),

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\bar{v}_n \in \mathcal{G}_n) &= \Pr\Big(\hat{z}_n + \frac{\bar{v}_n}{\bar{r}_{nn}} \in [\bar{l}_n - 1/2, \bar{u}_n + 1/2]\Big) \\
&= \Pr(\bar{v}_n \in [(\bar{l}_n - \hat{z}_n - 1/2)\bar{r}_{nn}, (\bar{u}_n - \hat{z}_n + 1/2)\bar{r}_{nn}]) \\
&\leq \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_n - \bar{l}_n + 1)\bar{r}_{nn})
\end{aligned}$$

where in deriving the inequality, we used (66).

Suppose for some $i > 1$, we have

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \prod_{k=i}^{n} \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_k - \bar{l}_k + 1)\bar{r}_{kk}). \tag{69}$$

Now we want to prove

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i-1}) \leq \prod_{k=i-1}^{n} \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_k - \bar{l}_k + 1)\bar{r}_{kk}). \tag{70}$$

For our proof, we partition the set $\mathcal{G}_i$ into a sequence of disjoint subsets. To do that, for $i = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$, we first define the discrete set

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \Big\{ \sum_{j=i}^{n} \frac{r_{i-1,j}}{r_{i-1,i-1}} (\hat{z}_j - z_j^{\text{OB}}(\boldsymbol{w}_{j:n})) \big| \boldsymbol{w}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i \Big\}.$$

Then, for any $t \in \mathcal{H}_i$, we define

$$\mathcal{G}_{i,t} = \Big\{ \boldsymbol{w}_{i:n} | \boldsymbol{w}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i \text{ such that } \sum_{j=i}^{n} \frac{r_{i-1,j}}{r_{i-1,i-1}} (\hat{z}_j - z_j^{\text{OB}}(\boldsymbol{w}_{j:n})) = t \Big\}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\cup_{t \in \mathcal{H}_i} \mathcal{G}_{i,t} = \mathcal{G}_i$ and $\mathcal{G}_{i,t_1} \cap \mathcal{G}_{i,t_2} = \varnothing$ for $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{H}_i$ and $t_1 \neq t_2$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}_i} \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}) \tag{71}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i-1}) &= \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i,\, z_{i-1}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n}) \in [\bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{u}_{i-1}]) \\
&= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}_i} \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t},\, z_{i-1}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n}) \in [\bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{u}_{i-1}]) \\
&= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}_i} \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}) \Pr\left(z_{i-1}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n}) \in [\bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{u}_{i-1}] | \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Now we derive a bound on the second probability of each term on the right-hand side of (72). By (51) and (50), we have

$$c_{i-1}^{\text{OB}} = \frac{\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}\hat{z}_{i-1} + \sum_{j=i}^{n} \bar{r}_{i-1,j}\hat{z}_j + \bar{v}_{i-1} - \sum_{j=i}^{n} \bar{r}_{i-1,j} z_j^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{j:n})}{\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}} = \hat{z}_{i-1} + t' + \frac{\bar{v}_{i-1}}{\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}}$$

where

$$t' = \sum_{j=i}^{n} \frac{\bar{r}_{i-1,j}}{\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}} (\hat{z}_j - z_j^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{j:n})).$$

If $\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}$ for some t, then $t' = t \in \mathcal{H}_i$. Since $z_{i-1}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n}) = \lfloor c_{i-1}^{\text{OB}} \rceil$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left(z_{i-1}^{\text{OB}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n}) \in [\bar{l}_{i-1}, \bar{u}_{i-1}] | \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}\right) \\
&= \Pr\left(\hat{z}_{i-1} + t + \frac{\bar{v}_{i-1}}{\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}} \in [\bar{l}_{i-1} - 1/2, \bar{u}_{i-1} + 1/2]\right) \\
&= \Pr\left(\bar{v}_{i-1} \in \left[(\bar{l}_{i-1} - \hat{z}_{i-1} - t - 1/2)\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1},\, (\bar{u}_{i-1} - \hat{z}_{i-1} - t + 1/2)\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}\right]\right) \qquad (73) \\
&\leq \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_{i-1} - \bar{l}_{i-1} + 1)\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}) \qquad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

where for the inequality we used (66). Thus, from (72) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i-1:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i-1}) &\leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}_i} \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,t}) \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_{i-1} - \bar{l}_{i-1} + 1)\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1}) \\
&= \Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{v}}_{i:n} \in \mathcal{G}_i) \phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_{i-1} - \bar{l}_{i-1} + 1)\bar{r}_{i-1,i-1})
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality is due to (71). Then the inequality (70) follows by using the induction hypothesis (69). Therefore, the inequality (68), or the equivalent inequality (65), holds for any fixed $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$.

Since (65) holds for any fixed $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$, it is easy to argue that it holds no matter what distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$ is over the box $\mathcal{F}$, so the theorem is proved. □

By Theorem 6, if $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\phi_\sigma(\bar{r}_{ii})}{\phi_\sigma((\bar{u}_i - \bar{l}_i + 1)\bar{r}_{ii})} \approx 1$, then $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B}) \approx 0$, i.e., the conjecture holds. The condition will be satisfied when the noise standard deviation σ is sufficiently small.

Here we make a comment on the upper bound in (63). The derivation of (63) was based on the two inequalities (64) and (65). The inequality (64) was established based on the fact that $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ in (62). If the absolute values of the

entries of the unimodular matrix $\boldsymbol{Z}^{-1}$ are big, then it is likely that $\mathcal{F}$ is much bigger than $\mathcal{E}$ although $\mathcal{F}$ is the smallest box to contain $\mathcal{E}$, making the inequality (64) loose. Otherwise it will be tight; in particular, when $\boldsymbol{Z} = \boldsymbol{I}$, then $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F}$ and the inequality (64) becomes an equality. In establishing the inequality (65) we used the inequality (66) (see (74)), which is simple but may not be tight if ζ is not close to $-\eta/2$. Thus the inequality (65) may not be tight. Overall, the upper bound in (63) may not be tight sometimes, but it is always tighter than than the upper bound in (60). The following example shows that the former can be significantly tighter than the latter and can be a sharp bound.

Example 3: We use exactly the same data generated in Example 2 to compute the upper bounds in (60) and (63), which are denoted by μ_{eb1} and μ_{eb2}, respectively. The results for $n = 5 : 5 : 40$ with $\sigma = 0.1$ are given in Table XI. To see how tight they are, the values of P_e given in Table IX are displayed here again. Recall P_e is the experimental probability corresponding to the theoretical probability $\Pr(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{x}} | \bar{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathcal{B})$ in (60) and (63).

From Table XI, we can see the upper bound μ_{eb2} is obviously tighter than the upper bound μ_{eb1} and μ_{eb2} is close to P_e. When $n = 10$, $P_e > \mu_{eb2}$, this is because there are some deviations between the experimental values and the theoretical values. The values of μ_{eb1} are actually not exactly the same for different n, but they are very close. This is also true for μ_{eb2}.

TABLE XI
P_e AND BOUNDS VERSUS $n = 5 : 5 : 40$ WITH $\sigma = 0.1$

$\boldsymbol{n}$	P_e	μ_{eb1}	μ_{eb2}
5	0.9356	0.9840	0.9364
10	0.9396	0.9840	0.9364
15	0.9336	0.9840	0.9364
20	0.9348	0.9840	0.9364
25	0.9325	0.9840	0.9364
30	0.9312	0.9840	0.9364
35	0.9304	0.9840	0.9364
40	0.9252	0.9840	0.9364

VI. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

We have presented formulas for the success probability P^{BB} of the box-constrained Babai estimator and the success probability P^{OB} of the ordinary Babai estimator for the linear model where the true integer parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is uniformly distributed over the constraint box and the noise vector follows a normal distribution. The properties of P^{BB} and P^{OB} and the relationship between them were given.

The effects of the column permutations on P^{BB} by the LLL-P, SQRD and V-BLAST column permutation strategies have been investigated. When the noise is relatively small, we showed that LLL-P always increases P^{BB} and argued why both SQRD and V-BLAST usually increase P^{BB}; and when the noise is relatively large, LLL-P always decreases P^{BB} and argued why both SQRD and V-BLAST usually decrease P^{BB}. The latter contradicts with what we commonly believed. And it suggests that we should check the conditions given in the paper before we apply these strategies. We also provided a column permutation invariant bound on P^{BB}. This bound helped us to understand the effects of these column permutation strategies on P^{BB}. Our theoretical findings were supported by numerical test results.

We have given an example to show that the conjecture proposed in [24] does not always hold and imposed a condition under which the conjecture holds.

LLL-P has better theory than V-BLAST and SQRD in terms of their effects on P^{BB}. But numerical experiments indicate often V-BLAST is more effective than LLL-P and SQRD. Developing a more effective column permutation strategy with solid theory will be investigated in the future. These three permutation column permutation strategies use only the information of $\boldsymbol{A}$. The effects of the column permutation strategies which use all available information of the model such as those proposed in [31], [7] and [6] need to be investigated.

Recently the success probability of the BILS estimator has been given in [28]. We intend to study the relationship between it and P^{BB}.

REFERENCES

[1] E. AGRELL, T. ERIKSSON, A. VARDY, AND K. ZEGER, *Closest point search in lattices*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 48 (2002), pp. 2201–2214.

[2] H. ARTÉS, D. SEETHALER, AND F. HLAWATSCH, *Efficient detection algorithms for MIMO channels: a geometrical approach to approximate ML detection*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 51 (2003), pp. 2808–2820.

[3] L. BABAI, *On lovasz lattice reduction and the nearest lattice point problem*, Combinatorica, 6 (1986), pp. 1–13.

[4] L. G. BARBERO AND J. S. THOMPSON, *Fixing the complexity of the sphere decoder for mimo detection*, IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, 7 (2008), pp. 2131–2142.

[5] J. BOUTROS, N. GRESSET, L. BRUNEL, AND M. FOSSORIER, *Soft-input soft-output lattice sphere decoder for linear channels*, in Proceedings of IEEE 2003 GLOBECOM, Dec. 2003, pp. 213–217.

[6] S. BREEN AND X.-W. CHANG, *Column Reording for Box-Constrained Integer Least Squares Problems*, in Proceedings of IEEE GLOBECOM 2011, 6 pages.

[7] X.-W. CHANG AND Q. HAN, *Solving box-constrained integer least squares problems*, IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, 7 (2008), pp. 277–287.

[8] X.-W. CHANG AND C. PAIGE, *Euclidean distances and least squares problems for a given set of vectors*, Applied Numerical Mathematics, 57 (2007), pp. 1240–1244.

[9] X.-W. CHANG, J. WEN, AND X. XIE, *Effects of the LLL reduction on the success probability of the babai point and on the complexity of sphere decoding*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 59 (2013), pp. 4915–4926.

[10] M. O. DAMEN, H. E. GAMAL, AND G. CAIRE, *On maximum likelihood detection and the search for the closest lattice point*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 49 (2003), pp. 2389–2402.

[11] U. FINCKE AND M. POHST, *Improved methods for calculating vectors of short length in a lattice, including a complexity analysis*, Mathematics of Computation, 44 (1985), pp. 463–471.

[12] U. FISCHER AND C. WINDPASSINGER, *Real- vs. complex-valued equalisation in V-BLAST systems*, IEE Electronic Letters, 39 (2003), pp. 470–471.

[13] G. J. FOSCINI, G. D. GOLDEN, R. A. VALENZUELA, AND P. W. WOLNIANSKY, *Simplified processing for high spectral efficiency wireless communication employing multi-element arrays*, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, 17 (1999), pp. 1841–1852.

[14] R. GOWAIKAR AND B. HASSIBI, *Statistical pruning for near-maximal likelihood decoding*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 55 (2007), pp. 2661–2675.

[15] Z. GUO AND P. NILSSON, *Algorithm and implementation of the k-best sphere decoding for mimo detection*, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, 24 (2006), pp. 491–503.

[16] G. HANROT, X. PUJOL, AND D. STEHLÉ, *Algorithms for the shortest and closest lattice vector problems*, Coding and Cryptology, 6639 (2011), pp. 159–190.

[17] A. HASSIBI AND S. BOYD, *Integer parameter estimation in linear models with applications to GPS*, IEEE Transactions on Singal Processing, 46 (1998), pp. 2938–2952.

[18] B. HASSIBI, *An efficient square-root algorithm for BLAST*, in 2000 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2004, pp. 737–740.

[19] B. HASSIBI AND H. VIKALO, *On the sphere-decoding algorithm I. Expected complexity*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 53 (2005), pp. 2806–2818.

[20] J. JALDÉN, L. G. BARBERO, B. OTTERSTEN, AND J. S. THOMPSON, *The error probability of the fixed-complexity sphere decoder*, IEEE Transactions on Singal Processing, 57 (2009), pp. 2711–2720.

[21] J. JALDÉN AND B. OTTERSTEN, *On the complexity of sphere decoding in digital communications*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 53 (2005), pp. 1474–1484.

[22] K.-C. LAI, C.-C. HUANG, AND J.-J. JIA, *Variation of the fixed-complexity sphere decoder*, IEEE Communications Letters, 15 (2011), pp. 1001–1003.

[23] A. LENSTRA, H. LENSTRA, AND L. LOVÁSZ, *Factoring polynomials with rational coefficients*, Mathematische Annalen, 261 (1982), pp. 515–534.

[24] C. LING, W. MOW, AND L. GAN, *Dual-lattice ordering and partial lattice reduction for SIC-based MIMO detection*, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, 3 (2009), pp. 975–985.

[25] S. LOYKA AND F. GAGNON, *Performance analysis of the V-BLAST algorithm: an analytical approach*, IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, 3 (2004), pp. 1326–1337.

[26] W.-K. MA, T. N. DAVIDSON, K. M. WONG, Z.-Q. LUO, AND P.-C. CHING, *Quasi-maximum-likelihood multiuser detection using semi-definite relaxation with application to synchronous cdma*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 50 (2002), pp. 912–922.

[27] Z. MA, B. HONARY, P. FAN, AND E. G. LARSSON, *Stopping criterion for complexity reduction of sphere decoding*, IEEE Communications Letters, 13 (2009), pp. 402–404.

[28] K. N. PAPPI, N. D. CHATZIDIAMANTIS, AND G. K. KARAGIANNIDIS, *Error performance of multidimensional lattice constellations - Part I: A parallelotope geometry based approach for the AWGN channel*, IEEE Transactions on Communications, 61 (2013), pp. 1088–1098.

[29] C. SCHNORR AND M. EUCHNER, *Lattice basis reduction: improved practical algorithms and solving subset sum problems*, Mathematical Programming, 66 (1994), pp. 181–191.

[30] B. SHIM AND I. KANG, *Sphere decoding with a probabilistic tree pruning*, IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 56 (2008), pp. 4867–4878.

[31] K. SU AND I. J. WASSELL, *A new ordering for efficient sphere decoding*, in Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Communications,, vol. 3, 2005, pp. 1906–1910.

[32] P. J. G. TEUNISSEN, *Success probability of integer GPS ambiguity rounding and bootstrapping*, Journal of Geodesy, 72 (1998), pp. 606–612.

[33] ———, *An invariant upper-bound for the GNSS bootstrappend ambiguity success rate*, Journal of Global Positioning Systems, 2 (2003), pp. 13–17.

[34] C. WINDPASSINGER, R. F. H. FISCHER, AND J. HUBER, *Lattice-reduction-aided broadcast precoding*, IEEE Transactions on Communications, 52 (2004), pp. 2057–2060.

[35] X. WU AND J. THOMPSON, *Accelerated sphere decoding for multipleinput multiple-output systems using an adaptive statistical threshold*, IET Signal Processing, 3 (2009), pp. 433–444.

[36] D. WUBBEN, R. BOHNKE, J. RINAS, V. KUHN, AND K. KAMMEYER, *Efficient algorithm for decoding layered space-time codes*, Electronics Letters, 37 (2001), pp. 1348–1350.

[37] H. ZHU, W. CHEN, B. LI, AND F. GAO, *An improved square-root algorithm for V-BLAST based on efficient inverse cholesky factorization*, IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, 10 (2011), pp. 43–48.